



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/749,870	12/31/2003	Shelly D. Farnham	MSI-1914US	6293
22801	7590	05/21/2007	EXAMINER	
LEE & HAYES PLLC			RAYYAN, SUSAN F	
421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SPOKANE, WA 99201			2167	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/21/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

lhptoms@leehayes.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/749,870	FARNHAM ET AL.
	Examiner Susan F. Rayyan	Art Unit 2167

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 September 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-28 are pending.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 8,11 are objected to because of the following informalities: claims depend from claim 0. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

3. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 1-7, 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Independent claim 1 recites “identifying components associated with a first end point in an environment”, “identifying components associated with a second end point in the environment”, “determining whether any of the identified components are associated with both the first end point and the second end point” and “identifying relationships between the first end point, the second end point, and any components associated with both the first end point and the second end point”. The limitations to not provide a tangible results such as storing or displaying the results of the identified relationships.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

Claims 1-3,15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by US Patent Number 6,832,245 issued to Ellen Isaacs et al ("Isaacs").

As per claim 1 Isaacs anticipates:

identifying components associated with a first end point in an environment (column 2, lines 41-50, as identify contacts (components));

identifying components associated with a second end point in the environment (column 2, lines 41-50, as identify contacts (components));

determining whether any of the identified components are associated with both the first end point and the second end point (column 1, lines 66-column 2, line 1, as identify priority to one another and column 5, lines 50-60);

identifying relationships between the first end point, the second end point, and any components associated with both the first end point and the second end point (column 2, lines 60-65, as determine contact id and relationships between).

As per claim 2, same as claim arguments above and Isaacs anticipates: wherein the environment is a social environment (column 1, lines 57-63, as contacts may be related to social networks such as personal life and workplace).

As per claim 3, same as claim arguments above and Isaacs anticipates: further comprising receiving a request to identify relationships between the first end point and the second end point (column 2, lines 45-49 and column 3, lines 9-11, as provide contact network to the user).

Claim 15 is rejected based on the same arguments as claim 1.

Claims 16,18,22-23,27-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by US Patent Number 6,486,898 issued Jacquelyn Martino (“Martino”).

As per claim 16 Martino anticipates:
displaying a first end point (Figure 5, reference number I7);
displaying components associated with the first end point(Figure 5, reference number I2);
displaying a second end point(Figure 5, reference number I8);
displaying components associated with the second end point(Figure 5, reference number I5);

displaying a common component associated with the first end point and the second end point(Figure 5, reference number I3);

displaying a link between the common component and the first end point(Figure 5, reference number L27);

and displaying a link between the common component and the second end point(Figure 5, reference number L28).

As per claim 18, same as claim arguments above and Martino anticipates:

displaying a second common component associated with the first end point and the second end point (Figure 5, reference number I6);

displaying a link between the second common component and the first end point(Figure 5, reference number L26,L12,L27).

and displaying a link between the second common component and the second end point(Figure 5, reference number L56,L58).

Claim 22 is rejected based on the same arguments as claim 16.

As per claim 23, Martino anticipates:

display a first end point in a social network (Figure 5, reference number I7);

display a second end point in a social network(Figure 5, reference number I8);

identify a common component associated with the first end point and the second end point(Figure 5, reference number I3);

display the common component associated with the first end point (Figure 5, reference number I2)and the second end point(Figure 5, reference number L27);

display a link between the common component and the first end point(Figure 5, reference number L27);

and display a link between the common component and the second end point(Figure 5, reference number L28).

As per claim 27, same as claim arguments above and Martino anticipates:

wherein the one or more processors further identify a second common component associated with the first end point and the second end point(Figure 5, reference number I6).

As per claim 28, same as claim arguments above and Martino anticipates:

wherein the one or more processors further display the second common component associated with the first end point and the second end point(Figure 5, reference number I6).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4-5,7-10, 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Isaacs et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of US Patent Number 6,486,898 issued to Jaquelyn Martino et al (“Martino”).

As per claim 4, same as claim arguments above and Isaacs does not explicitly teach wherein determining whether any of the identified components are associated with both the first end point and the second end point includes determining a path strength for each path between the first end point and the second end point . Martino does teach wherein determining whether any of the identified components are associated with both the first end point and the second end point includes determining a path strength for each path between the first end point and the second end point (column 4, lines 17-35, as location to indicate a relational distance from a reference node) to facilitate a recognition of the relationship among information items. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Isaac with wherein determining whether any of the identified components are associated with both the first end point and the second end point includes determining a path strength for each path between the first end point and the second end point to facilitate a recognition of the relationship among information items as described by Martino (column 2, line 65- column 3, line 2).

As per claim 5, same as claim arguments above and Isaacs does not explicitly teach determining a path strength for each path between the first end point and the second end point and ranking the paths between the first end point and the second end point based on path strength. Martino does teach determining a path strength for each path between the first end point and the second end point and ranking the paths between the first end point and the second end point based on path strength (column 5, lines 7-16 as nodes are ordered left-to-right based on degree of separation) to facilitate a recognition of the relationship among information items. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Isaac with determining a path strength for each path between the first end point and the second end point and ranking the paths between the first end point and the second end point based on path strength to facilitate a recognition of the relationship among information items as described by Martino (column 2, line 65-column 3, line 2).

As per claim 7, same as claim arguments above and Martino teaches:
wherein identifying relationships includes identifying only the top ranked paths between the first end point and the second end point (See Figure 5).

As per claim 8, same as claim arguments above and Isaacs does not explicitly teach further comprising displaying relationships between the first end point, the second end point, and any components associated with both the first end point and the second end point. Martino does teach further comprising displaying relationships between the first

end point, the second end point, and any components associated with both the first end point and the second end point (See Figure 5: Reference Numbers I7, I2 endpoints) to facilitate a recognition of the relationship among information items. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Isaac with further comprising displaying relationships between the first end point, the second end point, and any components associated with both the first end point and the second end point to facilitate a recognition of the relationship among information items as described by Martino (column 2, line 65-column 3, line 2).

As per claim 9, same as claim arguments above and Isaacs teaches:

wherein displaying relationships includes displaying information regarding at least one component (Figure 1, Reference Number 80: Content Display and column 3, lines 5-15 as listing of contacts).

As per claim 10, same as claim arguments above and Isaacs teaches:

wherein displaying relationships includes displaying information regarding at least one link between components(Figure 1, Reference Number 80: Content Display and column 3, lines 5-15 as listing of contacts).

As per claim 12, same as claim arguments above and Martino teaches:

wherein displaying relationships includes: displaying the first end point and

displaying the second end point; and displaying at least one common component associated with the first end point and the second end point (See Figure 5, display endpoints and common components).

As per claim 13, same as claim arguments above and Isaacs does not explicitly teach displaying a common component associated with the first end point and the second end point displaying at least one link between the common component and the first end point and displaying at least one link between the common component and the second end point. Martino does teach displaying a common component associated with the first end point and the second end point displaying at least one link between the common component and the first end point and displaying at least one link between the common component and the second end point (See Figure 5, display endpoints, common components, Links) to facilitate a recognition of the relationship among information items. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Isaac with displaying a common component associated with the first end point and the second end point displaying at least one link between the common component and the first end point and displaying at least one link between the common component and the second end point to facilitate a recognition of the relationship among information items as described by Martino (column 2, line 65-column 3, line 2).

As per claim 14, same as claim arguments above and Isaacs does not explicitly teach displaying the first end point, displaying the second end point, displaying components associated with the first end point and displaying components associated with the second end point. Martino does teach displaying the first end point (Figure 5, reference number I7), displaying the second end point (Figure 5, reference number I8) displaying components associated with the first end point (Figure 5, reference number I2) and displaying components associated with the second end point (Figure 5, reference number I5) to facilitate a recognition of the relationship among information items. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Isaac with displaying the first end point, displaying the second end point, displaying components associated with the first end point and displaying components associated with the second end point to facilitate a recognition of the relationship among information items as described by Martino (column 2, line 65-column 3, line 2).

Claims 6, 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Isaacs et al. as applied to claims 1, 5 above, and further in view of Martino et al and further in view of US Publication Number 2005/0086238 issued to Rocky Harry W. Nevin III (“Nevin”).

As per claim 6, same as claim arguments above and Isaacs further in view of Martino do not explicitly teach further comprising ignoring paths having a path strength below a

predetermined threshold. Nevin does teach ignoring paths having a path strength below a predetermined threshold to give the user easier access to relevant data and visually present large amounts of data and the relationships between them. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Isaacs further in view of Martino with ignoring paths having a path strength below a predetermined threshold to give the user easier access to relevant data and visually present large amounts of data and the relationships between them as described by Nevin (paragraph 172, lines 3-5).

As per claim 11, same as claim arguments above and Isaacs further in view of Martino do not explicitly teach wherein displaying relationships includes displaying a social context associated with the first end point and displaying a social context associated with the second end point . Nevin does wherein displaying relationships includes displaying a social context associated with the first end point and displaying a social context associated with the second end point (Figure 4) t to give the user easier access to relevant data and visually present large amounts of data and the relationships between them. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Isaac further in view of Martino with displaying relationships includes displaying a social context associated with the first end point and displaying a social context associated with the second end to give the user easier access to relevant data and visually present large amounts of data and the relationships between them as described by Nevin (paragraph 172, lines 3-5).

Claims 17,19-21,24-26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martino et al as applied to claims 16,23 above, and further in view of US Publication Number 2005/0086238 issued to Rocky Harry W. Nevin III (“Nevin”).

As per claim 17, same as claim arguments above and Martino does not explicitly teach teaches determining a path strength associated with the common component and and preventing the display of the common component if the path strength is below a threshold. Nevin does teach this limitation (at paragraph 73, as presenting data related to a threshold) to give the user easier access to relevant data and visually present large amounts of data and the relationships between them. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Martino with determining a path strength associated with the common component and preventing the display of the common component if the path strength is below a threshold to give the user easier access to relevant data and visually present large amounts of data and the relationships between them as described by Nevin (paragraph 172, lines 3-5).

As per claim 19, same as claim arguments above and Martino does not explicitly teach displaying a second link between the common component and the first end point. Nevin does teach this limitation (at paragraph 199 and Figure 1, as nodes linked together more than once) to give the user easier access to relevant data and visually present large amounts of data and the relationships between them.. It would have been

Art Unit: 2167

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Martino with displaying a second link between the common component and the first end point to give the user easier access to relevant data and visually present large amounts of data and the relationships between them as described by Nevin (paragraph 172, lines 3-5).

As per claim 20, same as claim arguments above and Martino teaches:

determining a strongest link between the common component and the first end point and highlighting the strongest link between the common component and the first end point (column 6, lines 60-61, highlighting).

As per claim 21, same as claim arguments above and Martino does not explicitly teach displaying a second link between the common component and the first endpoint and displaying a second link between the common component and the second end point.

Nevin does teach this limitation (at paragraph 199 and Figure 1, as nodes linked together more than once) to give the user easier access to relevant data and visually present large amounts of data and the relationships between them. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Martino with displaying a second link between the common component and the first endpoint and displaying a second link between the common component and the second end point to give the user easier access to relevant data and visually present large amounts of data and the relationships between them as described by Nevin (paragraph 172, lines 3-5).

As per claim 24, same as claim arguments above and Martino does not explicitly teach wherein the one or more processors further determine a path strength associated with the common component and prevent display of the common component if the path strength is below a threshold. Nevin does teach this limitation (at paragraph 73, as presenting data related to a threshold) to give the user easier access to relevant data and visually present large amounts of data and the relationships between them.

. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Martino with wherein the one or more processors further determine a path strength associated with the common component and prevent display of the common component if the path strength is below a threshold to give the user easier access to relevant data and visually present large amounts of data and the relationships between them as described by Nevin (paragraph 172, lines 3-5).

As per claim 25, same as claim arguments above and Martino does not explicitly teach wherein the one or more processors further display a second link between the common component and the first end point. Nevin does teach this limitation (at paragraph 199 and Figure 1, as nodes linked together more than once) to give the user easier access to relevant data and visually present large amounts of data and the relationships between them. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Martino with display a second link between the

common component and the first end point to give the user easier access to relevant data and visually present large amounts of data and the relationships between them as described by Nevin (paragraph 172, lines 3-5).

As per claim 26, same as claim arguments above and Martino does not explicitly teach wherein the one or more processors further display a second link between the common component and the first end point and display a second link between the common component and the second end point. Nevin does teach this limitation(at paragraph 199 and Figure 1, as nodes linked together more than once) to give the user easier access to relevant data and visually present large amounts of data and the relationships between them. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Martino with display a second link between the common component and the first endpoint and display a second link between the common component and the second end point to give the user easier access to relevant data and visually present large amounts of data and the relationships between them as described by Nevin (paragraph 172, lines 3-5).

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments, see amendment, filed September 25, 2006, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-28 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent Application Number 2003/0167324 issued to Shelly D. Farnham et al ("Farnham") have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made. See the rejections above.

Contact Information

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Susan F. Rayyan whose telephone number is 571-272-1675. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 7:30-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cottingham can be reached on 571-272-7079. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


SR
5/10/2007


JOHN COTTINGHAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100